As you une	Airstand, Were
Rule 27's	procedures
properly told	Towied in
L. Hansen's	situation?
	6
	COURT'S EXHIBIT NO. T IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE
	DKT. #

	1545454	3355555555
	When Ms. Day	mgat intervewed - wore's perfermanc
1.4.0	Mo. Harrson -	Loch > Why >
(White		tool ? Why?
		COURT'S EXHIBIT NO. Q IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE
		DKT. #DATE:

What were some of the roadblocks/complications That caused the investigation of to ge so long  Did you believe there were any other aptions other than Administrative leave  COURTS DESTRUCTION DET 1: 27-24			haminanniai	),
the road blocks / Complications That caused the investigation  of g to go so long  Did you believe there  were any other options other than Administrative  leave  count's  exhibit No. 2  JOHNT'S  EXHIBIT NO. 2  JOHNTIGATION REVIOLENCE				
the road blocks / Camplications That caused the investigation  of g to go so long  Did you believe there were any other options other than Administrative leave  COURT'S EXHIBIT NO. R IDENTIFICATION REVIDENCE	λ			
the road blocks / Camplications That caused the investigation  of g to go so long  Did you believe there were any other options other than Administrative leave  COURT'S EXHIBIT NO. R IDENTIFICATION REVIDENCE	O wh	at were	some of	
That caused the investigation  of g to go so long  Did you believe there  were any other options  other than Administrative  leave  counts  exhibit No. 2  identifications evidence				
Did you believe there  Were any other options  other than Administrative  leave  COURT'S  EXHIBIT NO. R  DENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE				1
Did you believe there  Were any other options  other than Administrative  leave  COURT'S  EXHIBIT NO. R  DENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE	<b>*</b> • •	to go	50 long	
were any other options other than Administrative leave  court's exhibit No. 2 identification/evidence		<b>O</b> .		
were any other options other than Administrative leave  court's exhibit No. 2 identification/evidence	-			
were any other options other than Administrative leave  court's EXHIBIT NO. P IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE	(1) Die	d you b	relieve there	
COURT'S EXHIBIT NO. PIDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE			I	
COURT'S EXHIBIT NO. PIDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE	ot	her than	Administrative	
COURT'S  EXHIBIT NO. P  IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE	le le	ale		
EXHIBIT NO IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE		· ·		
EXHIBIT NO IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE			,	
EXHIBIT NO IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE				
EXHIBIT NO IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE				
EXHIBIT NO IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE				
EXHIBIT NO IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE				
EXHIBIT NO IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE				
EXHIBIT NO IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE				
			FXHIBIT NO.	
			4	

1,944 1 AC A DO	
WHY WAS A PR	
NEEDED IF THE	FACIAL REVIEW
FOUND THE (TO)	IC / ATSUSIVE / SELF-
REPORT BY SE	N. GELSAR WAS
NOT A RULE	27 ISSUE?
The state of the s	
• .	
	· .
	COURT'S EXHIBIT NO
	IDENTIFICATION/EVIDENCE  DKT. #  DATE:

WAS TH	E RU	ie 14	INVEST	10A710N	
INITIATED	TECA	USE	o F	SEN, GO	ECSAZ'S
SELF - RE	PORT	+~P	THEN	EXPAND	EP 70
INCLUDE	MS-	HANSO	N,2	RETALIATI	017
CLAIM)	OR	DID	THE	12VES71	GATION
START	AFR	r –	THE	RETALIAT	TON
CULIM	WAS	MADE	?		
·					
	· ·	-			
		· ·			
	<u> </u>				
				COURT'S  EXHIBIT NO. \(\sum{\chi}\) IDENTIFICATION/EVI	DENCE
				DKT.#	